

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendments and arguments filed on 8/25/08. Claims 1-13, 15-16 are pending, and claim 14 has been cancelled by this amendment.

Specification

2. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a

nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Content of Specification

- (a) Title of the Invention: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications: See 37 CFR 1.78 and MPEP § 201.11.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development: See MPEP § 310.
- (d) The Names Of The Parties To A Joint Research Agreement: See 37 CFR 1.71(g).
- (e) Incorporation-By-Reference Of Material Submitted On a Compact Disc: The specification is required to include an incorporation-by-reference of electronic documents that are to become part of the permanent United States Patent and Trademark Office records in the file of a patent application. See 37 CFR 1.52(e) and MPEP § 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text were permitted as electronic documents on compact discs beginning on September 8, 2000.
- (f) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:
 - (1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S. patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."
 - (2) Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98: A description of the related art known to the applicant and including, if applicable, references to specific related art and problems involved in the prior art which are

solved by the applicant's invention. This item may also be titled "Background Art."

- (g) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.
- (h) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.
- (i) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.
- (j) Claim or Claims: See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(m). The claim or claims must commence on separate sheet or electronic page (37 CFR 1.52(b)(3)). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation. There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(i)-(p).
- (k) Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)), the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if

an abstract was published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See MPEP § 1893.03(e).

- (l) Sequence Listing. See 37 CFR 1.821-1.825 and MPEP §§ 2421-2431. The requirement for a sequence listing applies to all sequences disclosed in a given application, whether the sequences are claimed or not. See MPEP § 2421.02.

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 9-10, and 13, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sukkar (5,613,037) in view of applicant admitted prior art.

As per claim 1, Sukkar teaches a method for recognizing a keyword from a spoken utterance, with at least one keyword model and a plurality of garbage models, comprising the step of assessing a part of the spoken utterance as the keyword to be recognized, if that part matches best either to the keyword model or to a garbage sequence model, and wherein the garbage sequence model is a series of consecutive garbage models from that plurality of garbage models based on the finite state syntax (Col. 2, lines 47-52, Col. 5, lines 10-14 and lines 25-27, also Figs. 3, and 4. The keyword model is represented by the digit model and the garbage sequence model is represented by the filler model. More specifically, the plurality of garbage models is the HMM filler model).

Sukkar however, does not specifically teach the use of finite state syntax. Applicant however on pages 7 and 8 describe the use of finite state syntax which is also depicted in figures 2 and 4, which is applicant admitted prior art. The use of finite state

syntax is used to model garbage models, and an artisan with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use finite state syntax because, "Automatic speech recognition is used to recognize one or more keywords from a spoken utterance. Therefore, the applied recognition method is depicted as a finite state syntax. Fig.4 shows a prior art finite state syntax for recognizing one keyword. Such a finite state syntax compares any part of an incoming utterance with models representing a keyword to be recognized. In Fig.4, a keyword model, created for the keyword to be recognized is shown as one path. Further a plurality of garbage models g_i , where i is an integer, is shown. For example, some garbage models represent speech events, like e.g. filled pauses "em" or lip smacks.

As per claim 2, Sukkar teaches a method for recognizing a keyword from a spoken utterance, with at least one keyword model and a plurality of garbage models, comprising the steps of: assessing a part of the spoken utterance as the keyword to be recognized, if that part matches best either to the keyword model or to a garbage sequence model, wherein the garbage sequence model is a series of consecutive garbage models from that plurality of garbage models and wherein the garbage sequence model is determined (Col. 2, lines 47-52, Col. 5, lines 10-14 and lines 25-27, also Figs. 3, and 4. The keyword model is represented by the digit model and the garbage sequence model is represented by the filler model. More specifically, the plurality of garbage models is the HMM filler model);

by comparing a keyword utterance, which represents the keyword to be recognized, with the plurality of garbage models and (Col. 5, lines 10-14 and 25-27, where the HMM filler model represents the plurality of garbage models);

detecting the series of consecutive garbage models from that plurality of garbage models, which match best to the keyword to be recognized (Col. 5, lines 10-14 and 25-27, where the HMM filler model represents the plurality of garbage models and the filler string represents the series of consecutive garbage models which best match to the keyword).

Sukkar however, does not specifically teach the use of finite state syntax. Applicant however, on pages 7 and 8 describe the use of finite state syntax which is also depicted in figures 2 and 4, which is applicant admitted prior art. The use of finite state syntax is used to model garbage models, and an artisan with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use finite state syntax because, "Automatic speech recognition is used to recognize one or more keywords from a spoken utterance. Therefore, the applied recognition method is depicted as a finite state syntax. Fig.4 shows a prior art finite state syntax for recognizing one keyword. Such a finite state syntax compares any part of an incoming utterance with models representing a keyword to be recognized. In Fig.4, a keyword model, created for the keyword to be recognized is shown as one path. Further a plurality of garbage models g_i , where i is an integer, is shown. For example, some garbage models represent speech events, like e.g. filled pauses "em" or lip smacks" (specification, page 7).

As per claim 3, Sukkar teaches a method for recognizing a keyword from a spoken utterance, with at least one keyword model and a plurality of garbage models, comprising the steps of: assessing a part of the spoken utterance as the keyword to be recognized, if that part matches best either to the keyword model or to a garbage sequence model, wherein the garbage sequence model is a series of consecutive garbage models from that plurality of garbage models and wherein the determined garbage sequence model is privileged against any path through the plurality of garbage models (Col. 5, lines 10- 14 and 25-27, where the keyword model is represented by the digit model and the filler string represents the series of consecutive garbage models which best match to the keyword, the selected string being the privileged path).

As per claim 9, Sukkar teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the at least one garbage sequence model is determined, when a keyword model is created for a new keyword to be recognized (Col. 6, lines 1-4).

As per claim 10, Sukkar teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the keyword utterance is speech, which is collected from one speaker (speech 302 from Fig. 3).

As per claim 13, Sukkar teaches a computer program product with program code means for recognizing a keyword from a spoken utterance, with at least one keyword model and a plurality of garbage models, computer program product adapted to assess a part of the spoken utterance as the keyword to be recognized, if that part matches best either to the keyword model or to a garbage sequence model, wherein the garbage sequence model is a series of consecutive garbage models from that plurality of

garbage models when the product is loaded from a computer readable medium and executed in a computing unit (Col. 2, lines 47-52, Col. 5, lines 10-14 and lines 25-27, also Figs. 3, and 4. The keyword model is represented by the digit model and the garbage sequence model is represented by the filler model. More specifically, the plurality of garbage models is the HMM filler model. Also, Col. 4, lines 10-15).

As per claim 15, Sukkar teaches an automatic speech recognition device 100, implemented the method according to claim 1, including a pre-processing part, where a digital signal from an utterance, spoken into a microphone and transformed in an AID converter is transformable in a parametric description (Col. 4, lines 3-10, Col. 3, lines 62-64, and Figs. 1 and 2. It is noted that microphone is not specifically mentioned, however it is inherent that a microphone is present in the phone for receiving the verbal response from the user and performing speech recognition.); a memory part, where keyword models, SIL models, garbage models and garbage sequence models are storable (Col. 4, lines 10-13, Col. 3, line 62 to Col. 4, line 1, Col. 5, lines 21-25, and Figs. 2 and 4); a pattern matcher, where the parametric description of the spoken utterance is comparable with the stored keyword models, SIL models, garbage models and garbage sequence models (speech recognizer 122 from Fig. 2, Col. 4, lines 13-17, Col. 3, line 62 to Col. 4, line 1); a controller part, where in combination with the pattern matcher and the memory part, the method for automatic speech recognition is executable (central control 114 from Fig. 1, Col. 3, lines 36-37, 50-53, and 54-60.).

As per claim 16, Sukkar teaches a mobile equipment, with an automatic speech recognition device according to claim 15, wherein the mobile equipment is a mobile

phone (Col. 3, lines 20-22).

6. Claims 4, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sukkar (5,613,037) in view of admitted prior art, and in view of Wu et al. (US Patent 6,778,959), hereinafter Wu.

As per claim 4, Sukkar teaches the method according to claim 1, but does not specifically mentions further determining a number (N) of further garbage sequence models, which also represent that keyword to be recognized, and assessing the part of the spoken utterance as the keyword to be recognized, if that part of the spoken utterance matches best to any of that number (N) of garbage sequence models. However, Wu teaches determining a number (N) of further garbage sequence models, which also represent that keyword to be recognized (Col. 5, lines 51-57 and line 60 to Col. 6, line 4, also Fig. 5), and assessing the part of the spoken utterance as the keyword to be recognized, if that part of the spoken utterance matches best to any of that number (N) of garbage sequence models (Col. 5, line 62 to Col. 6, line 4, also Col. 6, lines 37-39.).

Sukkar however, does not specifically teach the use of finite state syntax. Applicant however on pages 7 and 8 describe the use of finite state syntax which is also depicted in figures 2 and 4, which is applicant admitted prior art. The use of finite state syntax is used to model garbage models, and an artisan with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use finite state syntax because, "Automatic speech recognition is used to recognize one or more keywords from a spoken utterance. Therefore, the

applied recognition method is depicted as a finite state syntax. Fig.4 shows a prior art finite state syntax for recognizing one keyword. Such a finite state syntax compares any part of an incoming utterance with models representing a keyword to be recognized. In Fig.4, a keyword model, created for the keyword to be recognized is shown as one path. Further a plurality of garbage models g_i , where i is an integer, is shown. For example, some garbage models represent speech events, like e.g. filled pauses "em" or lip smacks (specification, page 7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the features of determining a number (N) of further garbage sequence models, which also represent that keyword to be recognized, and assessing the part of the spoken utterance as the keyword to be recognized, if that part of the spoken utterance matches best to any of that number (N) of garbage sequence models as taught by Wu for Sukkar's method because Wu provides a method for speech verification using out-of-vocabulary models (Col. 1, lines 19-20) in order to increase accuracy and reliability of speech-activated systems (Col. 2, lines 2-4).

As per claim 11, Sukkar teaches the method according to claim 1, but does not specifically mention wherein the keyword utterance is speech, which is collected from a sample of speakers.

Conversely, Wu teaches the keyword utterance is speech, which is collected from a sample of speakers (Col. 5, lines 41-47. It is noted that Wu does not specifically mention the keyword utterance is collected from a sample of speaker, however,

according to applicant's specification, page 9, lines 5-7, the sample of speakers refers to the speech recognition system being speaker independent.).

Sukkar however, does not specifically teach the use of finite state syntax. Applicant however on pages 7 and 8 describe the use of finite state syntax which is also depicted in figures 2 and 4, which is applicant admitted prior art. The use of finite state syntax is used to model garbage models, and an artisan with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use finite state syntax because, "Automatic speech recognition is used to recognize one or more keywords from a spoken utterance. Therefore, the applied recognition method is depicted as a finite state syntax. Fig.4 shows a prior art finite state syntax for recognizing one keyword. Such a finite state syntax compares any part of an incoming utterance with models representing a keyword to be recognized. In Fig.4, a keyword model, created for the keyword to be recognized is shown as one path. Further a plurality of garbage models g_i , where i is an integer, is shown. For example, some garbage models represent speech events, like e.g. filled pauses "em" or lip smacks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the feature of the keyword utterance is speech, which is collected from a sample of speakers as taught by Wu for Sukkar's method because Wu provides a method for speech verification using out-of-vocabulary models (Col. 1, lines 19-20) in order to increase accuracy and reliability of speech-activated systems (Col. 2, lines 2-4).

As per claim 12, Sukkar teaches the method according to claim 1, but does not specifically mention wherein the keyword utterance is a reference model. However, Wu teaches the keyword utterance is a reference model (Col. 5, lines 32-40).

Sukkar however, does not specifically teach the use of finite state syntax. Applicant however on pages 7 and 8 describe the use of finite state syntax which is also depicted in figures 2 and 4, which is applicant admitted prior art. The use of finite state syntax is used to model garbage models, and an artisan with ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use finite state syntax because, "Automatic speech recognition is used to recognize one or more keywords from a spoken utterance. Therefore, the applied recognition method is depicted as a finite state syntax. Fig.4 shows a prior art finite state syntax for recognizing one keyword. Such a finite state syntax compares any part of an incoming utterance with models representing a keyword to be recognized. In Fig.4, a keyword model, created for the keyword to be recognized is shown as one path. Further a plurality of garbage models g_i , where i is an integer, is shown. For example, some garbage models represent speech events, like e.g. filled pauses "em" or lip smacks (specification, page 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the feature of the keyword utterance is a reference model, as taught by Wu for Sukkar's method because Wu provides a method for speech verification using out-of-vocabulary models (Col. 1, lines 19-20) in order to increase accuracy and reliability of speech-activated systems (Col. 2, lines 2-4).

7. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sukkar (5,613,037) in view of Wu (US Patent 6,778,959) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Goodman et al. (US Patent 6,654,733), hereinafter Goodman.

As per claim 5, Sukkar, as modified by Wu, teaches the method according to claim 4. Sukkar does not, but Wu does teach wherein the total number ($N+1$) of garbage sequence models are determined: by calculating for each garbage sequence model a probability value (Wu's Col. 5, lines 60-66). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the feature of calculating for each garbage sequence model a probability value as taught by Wu for Sukkar's method because Wu provides a method for speech verification using out-of-vocabulary models (Col. 1, lines 19-20) in order to increase accuracy and reliability of speech-activated systems (Col. 2, lines 2-4).

However, neither Sukkar nor Wu specifically mention selecting those garbage sequence models as the total number ($N+1$) of garbage sequence models, for which the probability value is above a predefined value. Conversely, Goodman teaches selecting those garbage sequence models as the total number ($N+1$) of garbage sequence models, for which the probability value is above a predefined value (Col. 13, lines 10-20).

The use of a cut-off threshold (selecting models with a probability value above a predefined value) as taught by Goodman for Sukkar's method, as modified by Wu, would have been a predictable modification given the known advantages of the cut-off

threshold such as reducing a list of candidates or hypothesis to the highest ranking ones, eliminating poor results, and reducing computation time for further processing of candidates or hypothesis. A person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized that it would improve similar devices in the same way. As per claim 6, Sukkar teaches the method according to claim 1, further detecting a path through the plurality of garbage models, which matches best to the spoken utterance (Col. 5, lines 10-14 and 25-27, where the HMM network contains the plurality of garbage models and the filler string represents the path of states that best match the keyword).

However, Sukkar does not specifically mention calculating a likelihood for that path, if the garbage sequence model is contained in that path and wherein for assessing a part of the spoken utterance as the keyword to be recognized, that path through the plurality of garbage models is assumed as the garbage sequence model. Conversely, Wu teaches calculating a likelihood for that path, if the garbage sequence model is contained in that path (Col. 5, line 58 to Col. 6, lines 4) and wherein for assessing a part of the spoken utterance as the keyword to be recognized, that path through the plurality of garbage models is assumed as the garbage sequence model (Col.5, line 58 to Col. 6, lines 4, also Col. 5, lines 18-26 and 41-45.).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the features of calculating a likelihood for that path, if the garbage sequence model is contained in that path and wherein for assessing a part of the spoken utterance as the keyword to be recognized, that path through the plurality

of garbage models is assumed as the garbage sequence model as taught by Wu for Sukkar's method because Wu provides a method for speech verification using out-of-vocabulary models (Col. 1, lines 19-20) in order to increase accuracy and reliability of speech-activated systems (Col. 2, lines 2-4). However, neither Sukkar nor Wu specifically mention that the path through the plurality of garbage models is assumed as the garbage sequence model when the likelihood is above a threshold. Conversely, Goodman teaches the path through the plurality of garbage models is assumed as the garbage sequence model when the likelihood is above a threshold (Col. 13, lines 10-20). The use of a cut-off threshold (selecting models with a likelihood above a threshold) as taught by Goodman for Sukkar's method, as modified by Wu, would have been a predictable modification given the known advantages of the cut-off threshold such as reducing a list of candidates or hypothesis to the highest ranking ones, eliminating poor results, and reducing computation time for further processing of candidates or hypothesis. A person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized that it would improve similar devices in the same way.

8. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sukkar (5,613,037) in view of Wu (US Patent 6,778,959), and further in view of Goodman (US Patent 6,654,733) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Stevens et al. (US 2002/0138265), hereinafter Stevens.

As per claim 7, Sukkar, as modified above, teaches the method according to claim 6, but does not specifically mention wherein the likelihood is calculated based on

the determined garbage sequence model and the detected path through the plurality of garbage models and a garbage model confusion matrix, and wherein the garbage model confusion matrix contains the probabilities $p(i/j)$ that a garbage model i will be recognized supposed a garbage model j is given.

However, Stevens does teach the likelihood is calculated based on the determined garbage sequence model and the detected path through the plurality of garbage models and a garbage model confusion matrix (Paragraphs [0161], [0162], [0165], and [0169]), and wherein the garbage model confusion matrix contains the probabilities $p(i/j)$ that a garbage model i will be recognized supposed a garbage model j is given (Paragraphs [0161], [0162], and [0169]).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the features of the likelihood is calculated based on the determined garbage sequence model and the detected path through the plurality of garbage models and a garbage model confusion matrix, and wherein the garbage model confusion matrix contains the probabilities $p(i/j)$ that a garbage model i will be recognized supposed a garbage model j is given as taught by Stevens for Sukkar's method, as modified above, because Stevens provides a method for correcting incorrect text associated with recognition errors (Paragraph [0019]) that reduces delays associated with correcting out of vocabulary (OOV) words by implementing an OOV global correction (Paragraph [0161]).

As per claim 8, Sukkar, as modified above, teaches the method according to claim 7. Sukkar does not, but Stevens does teach wherein the likelihood is calculated

with dynamic programming techniques (Paragraph [0169], lines 11-17). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the feature of the likelihood is calculated with dynamic programming techniques as taught by Stevens for Sukkar's method, as modified above, because Stevens provides a method for correcting incorrect text associated with recognition errors (Paragraph [0019]) that reduces delays associated with correcting out of vocabulary (OOV) words by implementing an OOV global correction (Paragraph [0161]).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13, 15-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vijay B. Chawan whose telephone number is (571) 272-7601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Friday 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Vijay B. Chawan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626

vbc
10/31/08